

## Is It Worth While?

By abolishing the liquor traffic from Missouri, we will reduce the number of convicts in the state penitentiary \$500. Is that worth while?

By driving the liquor traffic from Missouri we will reduce the number of inmates in the insane asylums more than forty per cent. Is that worth while?

By outlawing the whiskey traffic in Missouri we will reduce the number of jail commitments—more than fifty per cent of which are young men—more than sixty per cent. Is that worth while?

By stopping the manufacture of alcoholic liquors in Missouri the births of feeble minded children will be decreased more than thirty-three per cent. Is that worth while?

And we might go on ad infinitum; but surely these are enough. For where is the man in the state of Missouri, who will for all the revenue paid the state of Missouri in the past quarter of a century, willingly consign one of his own flesh and blood to the state penitentiary, an insane asylum, or become the father of a feeble-minded child? We would like to see the color of his hair.

## Roads Outlasted Civilization.

There are roads in Europe built by the Romans, which have outlasted the Roman civilization a thousand years. While we are building good roads in Missouri we would better build a civilization to go with them. For the same things which destroyed Rome—liquor and lust—are going to destroy Missouri if we do not heed the warnings of the past.

## Is It Common Sense?

Is it common sense to believe that the liquor traffic would oppose prohibition if prohibition increased the sale of liquor? No, you know better than that.

Only a fool would fight the enactment of a law which would increase his business. The liquor traffic has never yet been charged with being that kind of a fool.

## Who Will Pay the Taxes?

That's the question the brewers are putting up to the voters. Who pays them now? They don't. They simply rob the people of dollars and give back a few cents of their ill-gotten gains in taxes. This is certainly a most foolish way for the people of Missouri to pay taxes.

## Where Does It Come From?

The brewers of Missouri claim that they spend \$7,000,000 annually for grain products. But if so where do they get them? Not in Missouri! They use principally barley, rice, hops and Missouri produces none of these in quantities worth while.

## Are They Fools?

Is there a man anywhere, who honestly believes that the people of Maine would have lived under a prohibition law for fifty years if it hurt their business and increased their taxes?

Is there a man so foolish as to believe that the people of Kansas are silly enough to have lived under prohibition for a generation if that law was oppressive financially and otherwise?

Would it be in keeping with common sense to say that North Dakota, away up in blizzardy north region, would not have long since overthrown prohibition if it was at all burdensome?

And is it at all within the bounds of reason, to believe that state after state, to the number of nineteen, would have followed in the footsteps of Maine, Kansas and North Dakota, if it were true that prohibition was hurting these states?

And with the evidence of a half century before them is it at all reasonable to believe that the many other states asking for state-wide prohibition would do so? No, no, of course not.

The further away you get the liquor traffic, the fewer bootleggers and blind tigers there are. The liquor traffic breeds these vermin.

There isn't a day in any town or city where there are saloons that the liquor laws of the state are not violated. Then the liquor traffic says prohibition don't prohibit.

Every time the liquor traffic says prohibition don't prohibit, just that often it proclaims itself an anarchist. At the bottom of every violation of a prohibition law will be found the rum traffic.



CHARLES E. HUGHES.

## WILSON'S PERU PROTEGE IS WORSE THAN HUERTA

Recognized Benavides as President After He Had Obtained Power in a Sister Republic by Treachery and Violence.

## ACT DOES NOT SQUARE WITH SMUG DICTUM IN HIS SPEECH

Latin American Diplomats Amazed When They Read the President's Explanation of His Mexican Policy—Informed Their Governments That Mr. Wilson's Personal Whims Doubtless Were to Be His Guides in Conducting This Government's Latin-American Policy.

Latin American diplomats are amazed at the statement in President Wilson's speech of acceptance: "So long as the power of recognition rests with me the Government of the United States will refuse to extend the hand of welcome to any one who obtains power in a sister republic by treachery and violence."

This is the President's explanation of his refusal to recognize Huerta and of his Mexican policy. Yet the records show that President Wilson has deliberately violated this dictum in several instances since the case of Huerta arose.

The most flagrant example was the President's recognition extended to Col. Benavides, head of the revolutionary Government in Peru, in February, 1914. His Government was founded on assassination, established by usurpation and had no vestige of constitutional authority back of it. It came into power on February 4, 1914, when Col. Benavides led the garrison troops against the national palace at Lima, imprisoned President Billinghurst and assassinated the Minister of War and all others who opposed the coup d'état.

More Flagrant Than Mexico. Minister McMillin reported these facts fully to Washington and assumed that this Government would decline to sanction the newly established regime. The case was identical with the Huerta case in Mexico, except a much more flagrant violation of the spirit of popular government. Huerta had Madero and Vice-President Suarez imprisoned, but he became President of Mexico under provisions of the constitution providing for the succession of the Minister of Foreign Affairs upon the disability of the President. Huerta's accession to the Presidency was confirmed by the Mexican Congress.

Benavides came into power simply by killing those who opposed him. His acts had no basis whatever in the constitution of his country and were not confirmed by the Peruvian Congress. His sole backing was a junta of conspirators who forced their will on the unapproving people by means of ready rifle bullets. Under these circumstances Minister McMillin naturally assumed that President Wilson would have nothing to do with Benavides and his junta. The President shortly before this had stated in a speech at Mobile, Ala.: "We must follow the course of high principle, not expediency, no matter what the pressure. To do otherwise would be untrue to ourselves."

Envoy Is Surprised. Mr. McMillin was therefore mildly surprised when he was instructed by President Wilson to call on the newly established Benavides and graciously confer the recognition of the United States Government upon him.

In explaining this, the President simply said that "expediency dictated the recognition of Peru." He told his advisers that he had not liked the personality of Billinghurst. He was elated also with the news that Billinghurst had intended to dissolve the Peruvian Congress, which the President said would have been an unconstitutional act.

Latin American diplomats at the time were astonished to learn of the President's action in Peru. They found that it was impossible to know where the President stood on any matter of principle, and informed their governments that the President's personal whims doubtless were to be his guide in conducting this Government's Latin-American policy.

## A CONTEST OF CHARACTER, NOT OF WEASEL WORDS

CARDINAL QUESTION IN THIS CAMPAIGN IS WHETHER THE PEOPLE WANT IN THE WHITE HOUSE A PHRASE-MAKER, OR A MAN WHO BACKS WORDS WITH DEEDS.

Woodrow Wilson excels in the artistry of politics beyond the capacity of Charles Evans Hughes to compete. Were the current campaign a game of professional politics instead of a contest of character between two candidates for the highest office in the gift of the people, Mr. Wilson would walk away with the prize next November. All his life he has made a study of form—first of literary form—and latterly of political form. In the first period he mastered a style peculiarly his own, and peculiarly characteristic. The study of words and their multiplicity of meaning always fascinates him, so much that a Princeton classmate recently said of him: "Tommy has lived with words so long he thinks they are real things." Thence comes his collection of what Theodore Roosevelt's Maine Guide calls "weasel words." That is—the can take a word and weasel it around and suck the meaning out of it like a weasel sucks an egg, until it don't mean anything at all, no matter what it sounds like it means. Thence came also the series of catch phrases, so fascinating in sound, so false in suggestion; so easy to read, so hard to understand. So it is that he is able to be on all sides of every public question, while covering his circuitous course with a flow of words that roll as easily from his pen as a brook through the meadow. It is his artfulness in the use of words that enables him to pose as "an amateur in politics," while playing the game with the skill of a professional. Whatever his ineptitude in other respects, he is easily first among presidents in the artistry of politics, and he would win next November, were that the test.

Compare the willingness of Mr. Wilson with the straightforwardness of Mr. Hughes. Compare the smooth style of the one with the rugged diction of the other. The one is as complex in the use of words as the other is simple. It is a case of smoothness versus strength. Mr. Hughes is depending upon the strategy of straightforwardness and the strength of sincerity; upon the force of facts, instead of upon the fiction of a phrase, to win his case before the jury of the nation. His appeal is to the head and not the ear of the people; to their intelligence and not to their emotion; to their heroic side and not to their hysterical side. It is an appeal to the courage of the country and not to its cowardice. Mr. Hughes could not, if he would, perform in a year the political tricks that Mr. Wilson can do in a day. The question today is whether the people want in the White House for the next four years a phrase-maker or a history-maker; a man of many sayings, or a man who backs his words with deeds. There is a fundamental difference between the two candidates, which marks the line of cleavage in this extraordinary campaign—"Hughes means what he says."

## SOLILOQUY AT SHADOW LAWN.

Where are they gone, the old familiar faces? I had a friend—McCombs, but he left me. Left me slowly but surely, when I did not need him. All, all are gone, the old familiar faces!

Once I had Bryan; he was my friend in my hours of struggling in that great convention. But now he's gone. Left me with "God bless you!" Upon his lips. Gone, are the old familiar faces.

I had a friend; a truer friend had no man. Like an ingrate, I wounded my friend acutely. And he, good Colonel Harvey, left me. Left me. To muse on the old familiar faces!

At my right hand sat my friend Who was the strong arm of my Administration—Garrison, upright and honest—but he too has left me; Left me, when I deceived him—gone are the old familiar faces!

At Shadow Lawn, where new friends swarm around me, Earth seems a desert I am bound to traverse. Seeking to find the friends who've left me; But all, all are gone—the old familiar faces!

CHARLES LAMB, 24.  
In New York Sun.

Tammany leader Charles E. Murphy announces that he will retire after the campaign. It is believed that many other more or less distinguished Democrats will follow his example.

Grover Cleveland was the last Democratic President. He was also the last President to issue bonds to secure money to defray the running expenses of the government. But Wilson will tie him in this.

President Wilson will be notified of the Democratic nomination at Shadow Lawn. This seems a most appropriate place for letting him know that he will shortly have to give up his place in the sun.

President Wilson will not make any speaking dates, we are told, but only separate engagements for addresses, considering a "speaking tour" undignified. "Too proud to fight."

What Josephus Daniels, the well-known naval minister, can't understand is why men should waste time in Plattsburg at sea when they might just as well learn how to become sailors in three lessons in any good, reliable correspondence school.

## Tuesday, November 7th

## This Is the Big, the Fateful Day

Once more we are to decide for or Against Prosperity. The Democratic Low Tariff brought its usual train of distress.

It has never failed to do that.

The war, while it lasts, has restored protection through blockades and industrial paralyzation abroad. That explains the present war prosperity, which can't last longer than the war lasts.

We must restore permanent Protection and get ready for the after-the-war conditions. This policy always brings prosperity. It has never failed. We must declare for a Stalwart Americanism—one that will exalt the American name and American citizenship all over the world.

We must end Democratic extravagance and corruption in Missouri and open the books at Jefferson City.

All this may be done by voting the Republican ticket on Tuesday—for Hughes, for Dickey, for Lamm and for all the rest.

For a Republican to fail to go to the polls is to cast half a vote for the Democratic Ticket.

You can't afford to do that on Tuesday.

## When the Ghost Walks at Jefferson City



St. Louis Globe-Democrat.



EDWARD HIGBEE,  
Republican Candidate for Supreme  
Judge, Short Term.

Vice-President Marshall says Mr. Hughes is an echo of the past. Quite true. Of statesmanship, of patriotic performance and safe legislation.

First fruits of the Adamson bill: The New York street car strike. The debts of the Major-Gordon administration will aggregate at the close of this year more than \$2,000,000, including the money due the state school fund.



ROY F. BRITTON,  
Republican Candidate for Lieutenant  
Governor.

It is reported from Washington that the Administration will ignore most of Mr. Hughes' charges. That is very much the easiest way for it to answer them.

Governor Hughes announces in one of his speeches that he is a constructionist. But we are willing to admit that so far as Democratic policies are concerned he is a destructionist.



JAMES M. JOHNSON,  
Republican Candidate for Supreme  
Judge, Long Term.

It is a notorious fact that state finances were never in worse condition. While it is practically impossible to get access to the state records, it is known that the Major administration was the most extravagant in the history of the state and the state closed last year with a deficit of one and a half million dollars. Appropriations of the last legislature run riot and the revenues were over-appropriated \$4,973,275.

Mr. Wilson forgot to mention the pledges of economy in the 1912 platform.

"In his diplomacy," says Ollie James, "the President has sounded a new note." What, another one?



CHARLES W. FAIRBANKS.

## HOW LAND BANK BILL ORIGINATED

STORY TOLD BY MISSOURI FARMER IN ST. LOUIS BANK RESPONSIBLE.

## GARDNER STARTED INQUIRY

Visited European Countries and Investigated Different Rural Credit Systems—Now Up to People to Approve His Work.

Here is the true story of the origin of the Gardner land bank bill, which was passed by the last General Assembly of Missouri, signed by the Governor, and will be voted on by the people of the state at the November election as a constitutional amendment.

Nearly four years ago Col. Fred D. Gardner stepped into a St. Louis bank, asked the president for a loan, and got it. After he had signed a note, the president introduced the manufacturer to a Missouri farmer who was seeking a farm loan for a neighbor.

"You prosperous manufacturers ought to be happy. You never have to borrow money as we do," the farmer remarked to Colonel Gardner.

"No? Well, I've just received a loan," was the laughing reply. "Would you mind saying at what rate of interest?"

"Not if the bank president doesn't mind," was the rejoinder. "Four per cent," the president volunteered.

"Gentlemen, it doesn't seem fair," the farmer commented thoughtfully. "Here we farmers have the best security on earth to offer—a mortgage on farm land. The land can't burn or blow away. No fire nor cyclone insurance is needed. And yet, in my country, if we want a farm loan, we have to pay 6, 7 and 8 per cent interest, and often a bonus to an agent for finding the money for us. But a business man gets it for 4 per cent. He is not asked for a mortgage. He can come in next week and pay off the loan, and probably will be charged interest for the few days he uses the money."

"Can a farmer do this? No, sir. He has to renew his loan every five years and pay commissions. If he happens to get \$100 or more he is not permitted to make part payments to reduce the principal until the interest period arrives. In many cases we have to pay interest semi-annually, and this does not always suit the farmer. I tell you, he doesn't get a square deal."

"All other classes get protection, and I wish the good Lord would put enough brains in some man's head and kindness in his heart to help the farmer get money at a reasonable rate—say 4 or 5 per cent."

Colonel Gardner told a reporter that after the little party broke up he couldn't get this man's message off his mind. He spent a year investigating rural credits in Europe, and brought back a mass of data. He employed the best lawyers he could get to draw up the Gardner land bank bill. It was passed by both House and Senate in the last Missouri Legislature, and signed by the Governor.

And then Colonel Gardner suggested that in order to have all the people of the state pass on the measure, settle the question of constitutionality and avoid court contests, the bill be submitted as a constitutional amendment at the November election. The petition under the initiative has been prepared—St. Louis Star, May 10.

President Wilson seems to have founded his diplomacy on a rock which is off its base most of the time.

The Eastern witamiths persist in referring to the Secretary of the Navy as Miss Josephine Daniels. No wonder the Woman's Party is camping on the trail of the Administration!

Mr. Wilson forgot to mention the pledges of economy in the 1912 platform.

"In his diplomacy," says Ollie James, "the President has sounded a new note." What, another one?